REMARKS

This Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 is responsive to the final Office Action mailed June 18, 2008 and is filed concurrently with a Request for Continue Examination (RCE).

At the outset, the undersigned wishes to thank Exr. Puente for his time and courtesy during the recent telephone interview of August 5, 2008. As the Examiner will recall, agreement was tentatively reached during the interview that Benedikt does not teach or suggest determining a likelihood that a generated message is an error message, as Benedikt teaches a simple Yes/No determination of whether a message is an error message. Applicant also agreed to amend the independent claims to remove therefrom the alternative "or", such that the recitations drawn to the likelihood assigning steps must be considered. As the Examiner will readily determine from inspection of the amended claims, such has been done in the present amendment.

Claims 1-36 were rejected as being indefinite, under §112(2). Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

The Examiner's kind suggestions to amend the claims have been adopted. The Examiner's attention to detail in this regard is appreciated.

Claims 1-7, 9-18, 20-29 and 31-36 were rejected as being anticipated over Benedikt. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested, for the following reasons.

As noted during the recent telephone interview, Benedikt teaches the detection of errors in, for example, paragraphs [0047], [0049], [0052] and [0069]. Therein, Benedikt appears to

14

OID-2003-070-01

Serial No. 10/688,494
Atty. Docket No. ORCL5863

teach that either an error is detected or it is not, an all or nothing determination. Paragraph [0052] appears to be representative:

> the current page. Step 612 tests to determine whether there is an error in the execution of the choice. If the test result in step 612 is YES, there is an error, the error is logged in step 613 and the ExploreSite process is aborted in step 614. If the test result in step 612 is NO, the newly obtained page is retrieved in step 615. Thereafter, appropriate ones of steps 603 through 615 are iterated.

As may be determined from this paragraph, a message is either an error (step 612, YES) or is not an error (step 612, NO).

Paragraph [0064] of Benedikt teaches the ways in which errors are detected:

> [0064] Two broad classes of errors are detected by Veri-Web: navigation errors and page errors. Navigation (or execution) errors are detected by the Web Navigator 105, and include failure in retrieving a Web page (e.g., page not found) and unsuccessful form submission (e.g., onSubmit handler returns false). Page errors are detected by the Error Handler component 107 of VeriWeb, which can check various properties on visited Web pages. For example, pages can be analyzed using weblint, or checked against accessibility guidelines. They can also be "grepped" for strings that identify application specific errors (e.g., "cannot connect to database", "invalid customer") or for constraints that must hold throughout the Web site (e.g., all pages must contain a navigation bar). More complex graph-theoretic properties involving arbitrary sequences or trees of Web pages (e.g., constraints on frame combinations) could also be specified and checked, along the same lines as the verification of temporal properties of state spaces using model checking. VeriWeb is implemented in a modular way so that various existing checking modules can easily be invoked from the Error Handler 107.

That is, Benedikt teaches that failure to retrieve a page is an error (was page successfully retrieved Yes/No), as is a form unsuccessfully submitted, as is whether or not a message includes a grepped string for application specific errors, and like Yes or No determinations.

In contrast, the claimed embodiments require:

15

> when the website or web application generates a message in response to the applied standard input, consulting a knowledge base of standard errors, the knowledge base of standard errors storing a plurality of standard errors and matching the generated message to one of the plurality of stored standard errors ~~or~~ and when the generated message does not match one of the plurality of stored standard errors, assigning a likelihood that the generated message is an error message when the generated message does not match one of the plurality of stored standard errors in the knowledge base of standard errors, and
> generating a log entry, the log entry including at least one of an identification and a path of the generated page, the applied standard input and the generated message and a flag indicating that the generated message is an error message or is believed to be a potential error message.

That is, when the web application generates a message, a knowledge base of standard errors is consulted and the error matched with one of the plurality of standard errors stored therein and when the generated message does not match one of the plurality of standard errors, a likelihood that the generated message is an error message is assigned, and a log entry and a flag are generated, indicating that the generated message is an error message (when the generated error matches one of the stored standard errors) or is believed to be a potential error message (when the generated error matches one of the stored standard errors and depending upon the assigned likelihood).

Benedikt is not believed to teach or to suggest the assignment of a likelihood that a generated message is an error message, or the generating a flag when a generated message is believed to be a potential error message, as explicitly claimed herein, as Benedikt, as detailed above, appears to teach a Yes/No situation vis-à-vis error detection: a message or a condition constitutes an error or it does not.

Antecedent and enabling support for the language relating to the likelihood that an error message may be an error message may be found in the originally-filed specification at, for

OID-2003-070-01

example, paragraphs [0024], [0025] and [0031]. Antecedent support for this language may also

be found in the summary section and the claims.

For example, in paragraph [0025]:

> [0025]   If the generated error message matches one of the stored
> standard error or if the assigned likelihood that the generated error
> message is indeed an error message reaches a selectable threshold, a log
> entry may be generated. According to embodiments of the log entry
> includes sufficient information as to allow a post-facto reconstruction of the
> circumstances leading to the generation of the error message. For example,
> the log entry may include at least an identification and a path of the
> generated page, the applied standard input and the generated error
> message, as shown at S120. The log entry may also include a flag indicating
> that the generated message is an error message or is likely to be an error
> message. For example, the flag may be set when the applied standard input
> created an output (e.g., a message) that positively maps onto one or more
> entries in the knowledge base of standard errors.

That is, the flag may be set when the generated message maps onto <u>one or more</u> of the

entries in the knowledge base of standard errors. By <u>selecting a threshold and by determining</u>

<u>when the assigned likelihood reaches the selected threshold</u> (according to the previously noted

mapping, for example), <u>a generated message may be categorized as being a potential error</u>

<u>message</u>. Therefore, when

> there is no exact match in the knowledge base of standard errors for the
> generated message, a determination of the likelihood that the generated
> message is indeed an error message is carried out. Depending upon the
> outcome of this determination, a log entry may be created. The log entry
> may include, for example, an identification and a path of the generated
> page, the applied standard input, the generated message and a flag
> indicating that the generated message mapped onto one or more of the
> entries in the knowledge bases of standard errors.

as disclosed in paragraph [0031] of the originally-filed specification. Benedikt does not appear to

teach or to suggest any mechanism for determining the likelihood that a generated error message

is an error message, as tentatively agreed to during the recent telephone interview. Such lack of

17

teaching (or suggestion) is believed to constitute sufficient grounds for the Office to reconsider and withdraw the anticipation rejections applied to the claims.

As the Examiner will note independent claims 34, 35 and 36 have been similarly amended to remove therefrom the alternative expression "or", as agreed to during the recent telephone interview.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejections applied to the claims are, therefore, respectfully requested.

Applicant's attorney, therefore, respectfully submits the present application is in condition for an early allowance and passage to issue. If any unresolved issues remain, please contact the undersigned attorney of record at the telephone number indicated below and whatever is needed will be done immediately.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _August 6, 2008_   By: _____
Alan W. Young
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,970

YOUNG LAW FIRM, P.C.
4370 Alpine Road, Suite 106
Portola Valley, CA 94028
Tel.: (650) 851-7210
Fax: (650) 851-7232

C:\YLF\CLIENTS\ORCL\5863 (OID-2003-070-01)\5863 AMEND.2.doc

18

OID-2003-070-01

Serial No. 10/688,494
Atty. Docket No. ORCL5863